



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

BY JOHN P. PETERS, PH. D.,

Professor in the Protestant Episcopal Seminary, Philadelphia.

On page 25 of *Babylonian Life and History* Mr. Budge says: "It has been recently shown that the correct reading of the cuneiform sign for Akkad is Uru, and I think that there is no doubt that this is the Ur from which Abraham came." This situation of Ur of the Chaldees would agree better with Prof. Delitzsch's theory of the origin of the Chaldees than the received location at Mugheir.

In the last number of *HEBRAICA* I pointed out certain difficulties concerning the date of Nebuchadnezzar I. There are some peculiarities in the large inscription of that monarch which I do not remember to have seen mentioned. Col. I., 10, he is spoken of as ka-šid mat A-ḥar-ri-i "subduer of the West-land," i. e. Phœnicia. Did the Babylonians in the twelfth century actually penetrate to the Mediterranean? Again, in this inscription he is nowhere called by the proper title of a king of Babylon. In Col. I., 2, Hilprecht reads, it is true, malku Bâbili (the regular title, on the other hand, should be šar Bâbili) but Pinches and Budge agree in reading the same š-i-t Tin-tir-ki (Bâbili), i. e., "offspring of Babylon." Neither does Babylon play otherwise an important part in the inscription. Col. II., 3, it is mentioned along with Nipur as free from conscription, and Col. II., 18, the governor of Babylon appears in the list of witnesses. Col. I., 3, Nebuchadnezzar is called sakkanakku Eridi, "governor of Eridu," and Col. II., 24, among the witnesses, we find Nabû-ku-dur-ri-ušur amêlu êzzu mat Namar, "Nebuchadnezzar prince of the land of Namar." This inscription seems to have settled, as Hilprecht points out, that the name which some Assyriologists were inclined to read Zimri, with reference to זִמְרִי in Jer. xxv., 25, is in fact Namar. This country or district lies in the north-eastern part of Babylonia.

Among the archives which Mr. Hormuzd Rassam discovered in Ešarra, the temple of the Sun at Sepharvaim, a document of Nebuchadnezzar II. was missing. In his account of the very thorough search after ancient archives which he caused to be made by his army, as also a restoration of the temple, Nabonidus mentions Nebuchadnezzar II. as having been active in a similar manner. Now while Mr. Rassam found an inscription of Nabû-bal-iddina, and also documents of Nabopolassar, no inscription of Nebuchadnezzar II. seems to have come to hand. Within a short time the Metropolitan Museum of New York has obtained possession of what appears to be the missing document. It is a clay barrel-cylinder, eight or ten inches in length, perforated, about four inches in diameter at its middle point, and tapering to a diameter of approximately one and a half inches at the extremities (unfortunately I have mislaid my note of the exact measurement of the cylinder and have no cast by me). This was found at Aboo-Habbah (Sippara, Sepharvaim), and is an account of the restoration of Ešarra, the temple of the Sun, in Sippara. The script is archaic, the characters being strikingly similar to

those in the inscription of Nebuchadnezzar I. as copied by Hilprecht. There are three columns, of which the first contains twenty-seven, the second forty-two, and the third thirty lines. As one line in the second column is double, the actual number of lines is a hundred. Almost, if not quite, every line in the inscription can be read entire or supplied satisfactorily from parallel lines in other places. The first sixteen lines contain the titles, beginning (1) Nabû-kudur-ru-u-šur (2) šar mi-ša-ri-im (king of righteousness) and ending

- (12) za-ni-in E-sagili.....(restorer of Esagili)
- (13) u E-zi-da.....(and Ezida)
- (14) mâru ki-i-num.....(true son)
- (15) ša Nabû-pal-u-šur.....(of Nabopolassar)
- (16) šar Ka-dingir-ra-ki a-na-ku (king of Babylon am I).

It then proceeds to state how, by the orders of "Marduk, the great lord who has raised me to rule over them," Nebuchadnezzar restored the temple of Šamaš Ešarra which is in the midst of Sippara, which had fallen into decay. This section of the inscription ends at line 67 with the statement: E-šar-ra ša ki-ri-i-b Sippara i-na ħi-ṭa-a-ti u ri-ša-a-ti lu e-pu-uš "Ešarra, which is in the midst of Sippara, on account of sin and transgression had made." The remainder is an invocation and prayer to Šamaš, who is, of course, besought to accept favorably this work, to bless the king's deeds, prolong his life, and give him victory over his enemies. To the best of my knowledge this is the most important cuneiform inscription which has yet reached this country.

In the *Zeitschrift fuer die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Heft I. of the year 1884, the editor, Prof. B. Stade of Giessen, makes an acute suggestion for the emendation of the text of the fourth chapter of Isaiah which certainly deserves careful consideration, if not unqualified adoption. Presumably every student appreciates certain difficulties in that chapter in its present form. There is no proper connection between the Messianic conclusion, IV., 2-6, and the section II., 1-IV., 1, which it closes. The Messianic **בְּיָמֵי הַהוּא** seems to refer to the period described in IV., 1, rather than to the Messianic epoch. Then, too, verses 5 and 6 appear to form an anticlimax. Moreover, the construction of verses 4, 5 and 6 is unintelligible, no proper conclusion existing for the condition expressed in the **אִם** of verse 4. Prof. Stade also notices certain doctrinal difficulties of the last two verses. He suggests this arrangement: 4, 2, 3a, omitting 3b, 5 and 6. The passage would then read: (4) "When the Lord hath purged the filth of the daughters of Zion, and cleansed the blood spots of Jerusalem from her midst, with a breath of judgment, and with a breath of destruction; (2) In that day the growth of Jehovah shall be a beauty and a glory, and the fruit of the land a pride and an adornment for the escaped of Israel; (3) And it shall be, the remnant in Zion, and the remainder in Jerusalem, Holy shall it be called." This makes, probably, a far more forcible and logical Messianic conclusion than that offered by the present text. It brings the passage into immediate connection with verse 1; assigns to **בְּיָמֵי הַהוּא** its proper Messianic reference without the intervention of an ellipsis; and affords an intelligent conclusion to the condition contained in **אִם**. Even if we can follow Prof. Stade merely in the transposition of verse 4 to a position immediately after verse 1, without subscribing to his proposed omissions, much will have been done towards the elucidation of the difficulties of this important chapter.

I suppose the curious stanza formed by the names of the female luxuries mentioned in Isa. III., 18–23 must have been observed by commentators, but I have not been able to find any notice of it:

- העכסים והשבים והשהרנים (1)
 הנטפות והשרות והרעלות (2)
 הפארים והצערות (3)
 [ו]הקשרים ובתי נפש והלחשים (4)
 הטבעות ונזמי האף (?) (5)
 המחלצות והמעטפות והמטפחות (6)
 [ו]החרטים [ו]הגלינים והסרינים (7)
 [ו]הצניפות והרדינים (8)

Verses 1, 2, 3 and 6, 7, 8 correspond, with an exact reversal of the order of masculines and feminines. The strophe and epistrophe, if they may be so called, are separated by two verses; 4, containing two masculines separated by a broken phrase, and 5, containing a feminine followed by a broken phrase. These two verses do not, therefore, correspond to one another after the manner of the remainder of the stanza, and I suppose that a feminine plural has been lost from the text at the end of verse 5 (v. 21). At the beginning of verse 4, **והקשרים** should read **הקשרים**, and similarly in verse 7, **והחרטים** should read **החרטים**, and in verse 8 **והצניפות** should be put for **הצניפות**, and, on the other hand, in the seventh verse **הגלינים** must be read **והגלינים**. The analogy of all the other words in the last two verses shows that we must point this latter word **והגלינים** and not **הגלינים**, as in the Massoretic text. This involves its translation, as in the LXX. apparently, as thin silken tissues, rather than, as in the Targum of Jonathan, by mirrors. The former translation also harmonizes better with the context. The peculiar character of this stanza raises the question whether it was an original composition of Isaiah, or a popular song existing ready to his hand.

This last question forces itself still more strongly upon us, as it seems to me, in reference to the lyrical snatch contained in the fifth chapter of Isaiah. I believe commentators are reasonably well agreed that Cant. II., 15 is a fragment of a popular vintage song. Is not the same the case with Isa. v., 1, 2? Has not the prophet used a snatch of some popular vintage song as the text of a scathing sermon, in the form of a poetic parable, delivered or published probably at the vintage season? This would also account for the apparent play on words in the phrase **שירת דודי**, a play which becomes still more apparent when we compare **לירידי** with the name **ירידיה** given to Solomon, 2 Kgs. XII., 25. It may be said, in passing, that if we point, instead of **דודי**, **דורי**, the assonance with **לירידי**, required by the verse, is all the more striking. If my suggestion be correct, and we have a fragment of a vintage song with a punning allusion to David and his psalms, perhaps also to Solomon, the difficulties of commentators regarding the interchange of **דודי** and **ירידי**, as also concerning the exact sense of the verse, would vanish. (Or is it possible that we have here no vintage song with a punning allusion to the great Psalmist, but rather a reference to Ps. LXXX., which is admittedly prior to Isaiah's time?)